

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1, 3-6, 8-14, 16, and 18-23 are pending in the application. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8-14, 16, and 19-23. Claim 18 is objected to, but indicated as allowable. By this amendment, the Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 14, 19, 22, and 23. Support for these amendments can be found at least in paragraphs 0011, 0060, and 0068 of the Applicants' Specification. Claims 16 and 18 have been cancelled without prejudice. In view of the above amendments and the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are anticipated under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102 or obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in condition for allowance.

I. Rejection Of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 10-11 as being unpatentable over Mahajan (United States patent 6,618,358, issued September 9, 2003). In response, the Applicants have amended independent claim 10 in order to more clearly recite aspects of the present invention.

The Applicants submit that Mahajan does not disclose or suggest at least receiving a high data rate input data stream according to a first protocol, converting the high data rate input data stream to a second protocol based on a first recovered clock, and transmitting the converted high data rate input data stream in the second protocol based on a second recovered clock, as recited in claim 10. Accordingly, the Applicants contend that independent claim 10 is not anticipated by Mahajan and, as such, fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102.

Furthermore, claim 11 depends from claim 10 and recites at least all of the features recited in claim 10. Since Mahajan does not teach or suggest every feature recited in independent claim 10, dependent claim 11 is also patentable and is allowable. Therefore, the Applicants contend that claims 10-11 are not anticipated by Mahajan and, as such, fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102.

II. Rejection Of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Claims 1, 4-6, and 19-22

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-6, and 19-22 as being unpatentable over Mahajan (United States patent 6,618,358, issued September 9, 2003) in view of Peace (United States patent 6,687,260, issued February 3, 2004) and further in view of Mindspeed (“T1/E1 Framer and Line Interface Bt8379”).

As discussed above, Mahajan does not disclose or suggest at least receiving a high data rate input data stream according to a first protocol, converting the high data rate input data stream to a second protocol based on a first recovered clock, and transmitting the converted high data rate input data stream in the second protocol based on a second recovered clock, as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 19, and 22. Peace and Mindspeed fail to bridge this gap in the teachings of Mahajan.

Since none of Mahajan, Peace, and Mindspeed teaches or suggests receiving a high data rate input data stream according to a first protocol, converting the high data rate input data stream to a second protocol based on a first recovered clock, and transmitting the converted high data rate input data stream in the second protocol based on a second recovered clock, Mahajan in view of Peace and further in view of Mindspeed does not teach or suggest each and every element of the Applicants’ independent claims 1, 6, 19, and 22.

Accordingly, the Applicants contend that independent claims 1, 6, and 19, and 22 are patentable over the combination of Mahajan, Peace, and Mindspeed and, as such, fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103. Furthermore, claims 4-5 and 20-21 depend, respectively, from independent claims 1 and 19 and recite at least all of the features recited in independent claims 1 and 19. Since Mahajan in view of Peace and further in view of Mindspeed does not teach or suggest Applicants’ invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 19, dependent claims 4-5 and 20-21 are also patentable and are allowable. Therefore, the Applicants contend that claims 1, 4-6, and 19-22 are patentable over Mahajan in view of Peace and further in view of Mindspeed and, as such, fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103.

B. Claim 3

The Examiner rejected claim 3 as being unpatentable over Mahajan in view of Peace and Mindspeed and further in view of Tang (US Publication No. 2002/0075981). In response, the Applicants have amended independent claim 1, as discussed above, in order to more clearly recite aspects of the present invention.

As discussed above, Mahajan in view of Peace and further in view of Mindspeed does not teach or suggest at least receiving a high data rate input data stream according to a first protocol, converting the high data rate input data stream to a second protocol based on a first recovered clock, and transmitting the converted high data rate input data stream in the second protocol based on a second recovered clock, as recited by claim 1. This deficiency is not bridged by the teaching of Tang.

Therefore, Applicants contend that dependent claim 3, which depends from independent claim 1 and recites at least the same features, is patentable over the combination of Mahajan, Peace, Mindspeed, and Tang and, as such, fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103.

C. Claims 8-9

The Examiner rejected claims 8-9 as being unpatentable over Mahajan in view of Peace and further in view of Ohtsuka (United States patent 5,388,100, issued February 7, 1995). In response, the Applicants have amended independent claim 8 in order to more clearly recite aspects of the present invention.

As discussed above, Mahajan and Peace both fail to teach or suggest at least receiving a high data rate input data stream according to a first protocol, converting the high data rate input data stream to a second protocol based on a first recovered clock, and transmitting the converted high data rate input data stream in the second protocol based on a second recovered clock, as recited in the Applicants' independent claim 8. This deficiency is not bridged by the teaching of Ohtsuka.

Furthermore, claim 9 depends from independent claim 8 and recites at least all of the features recited in independent claim 8. Since Mahajan in view of Peace and further in view of Ohtsuka does not teach or suggest Applicants' invention as recited in independent claim 8, dependent claim 9 is also patentable and is allowable. Therefore, the Applicants contend that claims 8-9 are patentable over Mahajan in view

of Peace and further in view of Ohtsuka and, as such, fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103.

D. Claim 12

The Examiner rejected claim 12 as being unpatentable over Mahajan in view of Galuszka (US Patent No. 5,519,693, issued May 21, 1996). In response, the Applicants have amended independent claim 10, as discussed above, in order to more clearly recite aspects of the present invention.

As discussed above, Mahajan does not teach or suggest at least receiving a high data rate input data stream according to a first protocol, converting the high data rate input data stream to a second protocol based on a first recovered clock, and transmitting the converted high data rate input data stream in the second protocol based on a second recovered clock, as recited by claim 10. This deficiency is not bridged by the teaching of Galuszka.

Therefore, Applicants contend that dependent claim 12 which depends from independent claim 10 and recites at least the same features, is patentable over the combination of Mahajan and Galuszka and, as such, fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103.

E. Claim 13

The Examiner rejected claim 13 as being unpatentable over Mahajan in view of Peace. In response, the Applicants have amended independent claim 10, as discussed above, in order to more clearly recite aspects of the present invention.

As discussed above, Mahajan and Peace fail to teach or suggest at least receiving a high data rate input data stream according to a first protocol, converting the high data rate input data stream to a second protocol based on a first recovered clock, and transmitting the converted high data rate input data stream in the second protocol based on a second recovered clock, as recited in the Applicants' independent claim 10.

Therefore, Applicants contend that dependent claim 13 which depends from independent claim 10 and recites at least the same features, is patentable over the

combination of Mahajan and Peace and, as such, fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103.

F. Claims 14 and 16

The Examiner rejected claims 14 and 16 as being unpatentable over Mahajan in view of Mann (United States patent 5,251,210, issued October 5, 1993). The Applicants have amended claim 14 to include the elements of claims 16 and 18 which the Examiner indicated was allowable. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14, as amended, is allowable.

G. Claim 23

The Examiner rejected claim 23 as being unpatentable over Mahajan in view of Hashiguchi. In response, the applicants have amended independent claim 23 in order to more clearly recite aspects of the present invention.

As discussed above, neither Mahajan nor Hashiguchi teaches or suggests at least receiving a high data rate input data stream according to a first protocol, converting the high data rate input data stream to a second protocol based on a first recovered clock, and transmitting the converted high data rate input data stream in the second protocol based on a second recovered clock, as claimed in the Applicants' independent claim 23.

Since Mahajan in view of Hashiguchi does not teach or suggest Applicants' invention as recited in independent claim 23, the Applicants contend that claim 23 is patentable over Mahajan in view of Hashiguchi and, as such, fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the comments regarding the allowability of claim 18. In response, the Applicants have rewritten independent claim 14 to include the elements of claim 18 also the elements of intervening claim 16. As such, the Applicants believe that claim 14, as amended, is allowable.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the Applicants submit that none of the claims presently in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring issuance of an adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Thomas George at 408-879-4682 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

All claims should be now be in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Thomas George, 45,740 /

Thomas George
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 45,740

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed via EFS-Web with the United States Patent & Trademark Office on December 23, 2009.

/Katherine Stofer/
Typed Name: Katherine Stofer